UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Embarrassment of Religious Liberalism
- - - - - *George Yeisley Rusk*

Religion in Russia—Word and Deed
- - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

Who Shall Tell Us What to Drink ?
- - - - *Mrs. Margaret C. Munns*

Christian Refugees from Germany
- - - - *John Haynes Holmes*

The Women's Congress in Salzburg
- - - - - - *Ellen Hörup*

What Is Was Meant To Be
By a Young Girl in the Hills of Kentucky

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVIII NUMBER 6

Chicago, November 16, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice — *Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 103
Jottings—J. H. H. 105

ARTICLES—

Selected—*Giuseppe Mazzini* 103
The Embarrassment of Religious Liberalism—GEORGE YEISLEY RUSK 106
A Modern Credo—CURTIS W. REESE 107
Religion in Russia—Word and Deed—VICTOR S. YARROS 108
Who Shall Tell Us What to Drink?—MRS. MARGARET C. MUNNS 109
Christian Refugees from Germany—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 110
The Women's Congress in Salzburg—ELLEN HORUP 111
What Is Was Meant To Be—BY A YOUNG GIRL IN THE HILLS OF KENTUCKY. 112

POETRY—

Tolerance—*Witter Bynner* 108
Deluge of Blood—CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS 117

THE STUDY TABLE—

Fascism or Socialism?—ANNA MAE DAVIS 114
An Experiment in Production for Use—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 115
The Way of Liberty—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 115
Martyrdom—FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN 116
Nationalism and Imperialism—JAMES M. YARD 117

THE FIELD—

No More War Movement—Emergency Resolutions Adopted at Annual Conference 102
An Englishwoman Looks at Europe—ROSA DARTLE 118
Once More—How Much Is a Billion?—*No Frontier News Service* 119
Support for Birth Control Bill Growing, Says Margaret Sanger 119
Eddington Doubts Science Aids Faith—*New York Times* 120

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

No More War Movement

Emergency Resolutions Adopted at Annual Conference Held at Bristol, England, October 16-18, 1936

Labor and War

This Conference views with alarm the fact that a further fatal step has been taken by the Labor Party towards complete cooperation in the war preparations of the National Government.

While it recognizes that this is the logical consequence of the endorsement by the Labor Party of the conception of "Collective Security" it again affirms its conviction that "Collective Security" is not only unsound in principle, but inapplicable except where it would serve to conceal the motives of an Imperialist struggle for which the sanction of Geneva could be invoked.

This Conference notes with encouragement the strong minority vote at the recent Labor Party Conference, and also the growth of other movements demanding a constructive peace policy. It calls for united action by all organizations and individuals who share its concern in the matter and asks for unity in a national campaign to obtain the maximum support for:

a. A policy of rapid socialization at home.

b. The freeing of "Colonial" peoples, and thus of their trade systems.

c. A policy of disarmament as a necessary condition for the achievement of democracy and peace.

d. Securing Parliamentary Candidates pledged to support such a policy and to oppose all war credits.

e. Individual and collective war resistance and building up the necessary machinery to make such resistance effective.

Industrial Conscription and Exploitation of the Unemployed

This Conference warns all who are opposed to war, or to attacks upon liberty of conscience, against present trends towards industrial conscription. We draw attention to the fact that industrial conscription is already being applied by means of the Labor Exchanges, where in certain cases those who refuse to make munitions have been denied benefits, and we ask that these cases be taken up individually in every locality and made the subject of press campaigns and Parliamentary questions.

(*Continued on page* 118)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVIII MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1936 No. 6

THE VISION OF THE FUTURE

I see the people pass before my eyes in the livery of wretchedness and political subjection, ragged and hungry, painfully gathering the crumbs that wealth tosses insultingly to it, or lost and wandering in riot and the intoxication of a brutish, angry, savage joy; and I remember that those brutalized faces bear the finger-print of God, the mark of the same mission as our own. I lift myself to the vision of the future and behold the people rising in their majesty, brothers in one faith, one bond of equality and love, one ideal of citizen virtue that ever grows in beauty, ungoaded by wretchedness, awed by the consciousness of its rights and duties. And in the presence of that vision my heart beats with anguish for the present and glorying for the future.

Giuseppe Mazzini.

UNITY SUBSCRIPTIONS AS CHRISTMAS GIFTS

The approach of Thanksgiving marks the beginning of that glad holiday season of which Christmas is the crown and glory. Already, we have no doubt, many members of the UNITY family are plotting and planning their Yuletide giving. Our beloved wives, for example, already have things so carefully prepared that we wonder what will remain to make Christmas hurried as well as happy. Anticipating that there are others who are thus forehanded, we rise up early to commend UNITY as a gift from friend to friend. We wish that every subscriber to this magazine would give at least one new subscription to some kinsman or comrade, either a regular subscription for a year at $3.00 or a trial subscription for six months at the special price of $1.00—whichever the purse allows. This is a gift which renews itself, as flowers, or candy, or even books do not. For week after week, UNITY comes to bring not only its own message but the remembrance of a loving heart. And it is a gift to us also, as giving us new strength and greater courage.

THE ELECTION SWEEP

Now that the election is all over, we marvel at the excitement which it stirred and the campaigning efforts which it enlisted We now know that the issue was all determined before the nominating conventions met. That vast silent vote, touched by no "straw" balloting, moved by no appeals, hard set by sentiment rather than reason, was for the President from the beginning and moved like a tidal flood when it was at last released. The forces, long at work, are obvious. The captivating personality of the President, the evidences of sure business recovery, the vast expenditures of money poured directly into the hands of the people through one pretext or another, the marvelous political organization of "Jim" Farley, the capture of solid groups of voters such as the negroes and organized labor—all these and other influences played their part. Money had a decisive effect upon the outcome, a fact most sinister in its ultimate implications. But more important than anything else, we believe, was the fixed conviction of the great masses of the common people, alike in city and in country, that Mr. Roosevelt was their friend and champion. Nothing could shake this idea. The fixed hostility of business only confirmed and strengthened it. For the first time in American history we had an election which was basically an example of the class struggle. It was the workers on farm and in factory, and in office, against the upper employing group. The Marxian process, in other words, like it or not, is at work. This is the reason why the famous *Literary Digest* poll collapsed so completely. Its shower of ballots simply failed to percolate down to those great masses of the city and rural proletariat which voted almost unanimously for what was to them, in appearance at least, a genuine New Deal. This is a tremendous triumph for the President. What will he do with it?

ELECTION DISCLOSURES

The election disclosed some amazing facts. One is the insignificance of minority parties. What did the Union and Socialist and Communist Parties really amount to in this campaign? Nothing at all! Think this over when considering the question of a new third party in 1940! Another fact is the futility of demagoguery. Where are the 9,000,000 votes that Townsend, Coughlin, and Gerald Smith were going to muster for the defeat of Roosevelt? These men are done for—and good riddance! Still another interesting fact is the insignificant influence of the Jeffersonian Democrats who "took a walk." We doubt if these men swung a hundred thousand votes away from the President. The American people are committed to the two old parties, and that's the end of it. Again, we note the almost complete collapse of the newspaper as an organ or influence of public opinion. Two-thirds of the press of the country was pro-Landon. The enormous Hearst chain, the proud Chicago *Tribune,* the brilliant New York

Herald-Tribune, highly respected and intelligent papers like the Baltimore *Sun,* the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch,* the Kansas City *Star,* rural sheets innumerable, were all opposed to the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. And what did editorial, cartoon, and biased news-columns amount to? Last there remains the radio, the magic and mystery of modern political campaigning. This one device has completely changed the character of electoral methods in this country—and all for the better, as we look at it. If there is any such thing as appealing to reason and persuading opinion, we believe it is to be found in this instrument which enters straight into the home and talks to the voter man to man. We seem to feel that stupendous political rallies, with their elaborately pumped-up enthusiasm, will rapidly become a thing of the past, as the old-fashioned election nights, with their wild orgies upon the public streets, are already a thing of the past. Here Roosevelt still remains the master indeed! Perhaps he will be longest remembered as the man who introduced the new era of history by radio.

IS AMERICA DESTINED TO BECOME A DESERT?

Droughts, sand storms, dust bowls are some of the new and terrifying terms suddenly coming into our American vocabulary. A marvelously fertile soil seems to be turning against us. Nature is betraying us. We are beginning to suffer experiences which remind us unpleasantly of Egypt, Peru, and Yucatan. Are these disasters of blasting heat, rainless skies, and withered crops—variegated at intervals by devouring floods and hurricanes—to be regarded as tragic episodes, or do they presage something permanent and therefore formidable in the life of this continent? These questions, as it happens, are being answered at just this time, when the worst drought in our history is eating us up, in ways that may well give us something of a shock. Thus, the National Resources Committee has just been reporting to the President, and these are some of the things it says:

"Most of the territory occupied by the United States is not naturally suited for a permanent civilization. . . .

"Our soil is not enriched by the usual methods of cultivation but impoverished. By the normal process of our farming, mining, and lumbering, we create a desert. Americans need to realize that all other national hopes and aspirations are secondary to the question whether we can continue to eat. . . .

"Any nation whose land naturally tends to turn into desert must either take measures to preserve the land or it will surely die."

Another scientific inquiry, that of the Soil Conservation Service, presents the following conclusion:

"Just as with bodily diseases such as cancer and tuberculosis which can be cured only in the early stages, so it is with soils built through the ages. Once ravaged beyond a certain point, they are incapable of restoration except by nature's slow processes, which are measured not in tens but in thousands of years. Leaving out all 'ifs, ands, and buts', running the risk of being precise in an area where precision may have no place, [we] believe that at our present rate of soil erosion, this country of ours has left to it less than a century of virile national existence. We have two decades at the most to plan our campaign."

As long ago as the days of Theodore Roosevelt we were told that we must conserve our natural resources. Now the day of judgment seems to be approaching. What are we going to do about it?

CLASS WAR AND PACIFISM

International wars are bad enough, but civil wars are worse. The most dreadful fighting of the World War came after that war was finished on the western and eastern fronts and yet went on in the ferocious fighting between "reds" and "whites" in Russia. The struggle in Spain between Left Loyalists and Right Rebels is so horrible that correspondents on the spot can apparently not find words to describe the gruesomeness of what they see. On both sides the law of Spaniard against Spaniard seems to be extermination. To match these ghastly episodes of our modern day, one must go back to the religious wars that followed the Reformation and Counter-Reformation of three centuries ago. Then Catholics massacred Protestants—it was Frenchman against Frenchman, and German against German, and Englishman against Englishman (or Irishman), and no mercy anywhere. The Thirty Years War, an internecine strife which denuded great areas of Europe of population and turned cultivated lands into wildernesses again, was the supreme horror of that age of civil strife. Now it seems, in the light of what is going on in Spain, that class war may do in our time what religious war did in the old time. All Europe may be swept by the struggle between Fascist and Communist, as once it was swept by the struggle between Catholic and Protestant. And if so, we shall see such torture, slaughter, and useless cruelty as we have not yet known. It might be well for this ghastly circumstance to be pondered by those curious persons among us who make distinction between international wars and civil (or class) wars in favor of the latter, and still call themselves pacifists. Many, especially of our young radicals, are arguing that wars between nations are terrible, but that wars inside nations, i.e., between classes, are all right. They would refuse to take up arms in a war against a foreign power, but would gladly fight in a war at home between lefts and rights. The perfect answer to this moral fallacy is now seen in Spain. If there are any sound arguments against war, these arguments are soundest against civil war. If there is any fighting that is an abomination unto the Lord, it is civil fighting. Pacifism allows of no exceptions. "Thou shalt not kill" has universal application, *beginning* with our own brethren.

FOOTBALL AND BOOZE

The excitement over flask-drinking at football games, which swept the colleges some weeks ago and has since been sustained in public discussion, we would set down here as a significant sign of the times. President Dodds, of Princeton, who started the furore by requesting attendants at the games to leave their flasks at home, must obviously have become disgusted by the

spectacles of indecency which are to be seen in the stadia when the boys go on the loose with booze. That he is not the only one thus disgusted is proved by the chorus of approval which greeted his statement of shame and indignation. Protest was obviously seething in the breasts of thousands who needed only one brave man to speak out, and they exploded. But disgust of this kind is not limited to intercollegiate football games. It is growing everywhere, as drunks reel down our city streets, as women stand at bars or totter at cocktail parties, as drinking drivers smash their cars and others' cars, in fearful collisions upon the roads. Little by little we are beginning to see that booze is running wild. What repeal did was to release liquor not merely from suppression but also from control. We might have known from earlier experience, in the days before Prohibition, that the liquor traffic is utterly lawless, and that no license or regulation system has ever done anything but open the flood-gates and inundate the land. Now conditions are getting back to where they were when an outraged public resorted to Prohibition to curb an evil which had become intolerable. And the same conditions will of course again produce the same result. It is no accident that all the old "dry" societies are coming to life again, and finding ample support. It is similarly no accident that local-option laws are everywhere being submitted to cities and villages, and at every election are being adopted in increasing number. Slowly the "dry" area is widening—and it will continue to widen until it has once more embraced the land. Booze is beastly, brutish, bawdish; it is vulgar, indecent, obscene. A basically self-respecting people will not long tolerate the outrage of its presence.

A WORD FOR PURITANISM

It is reassuring to read in the *Christian Leader* an article describing Professor Santayana's widely read *The Last Puritan* as "a much overrated novel." We read the book with interest and with admiration of its impeccable literary style, but with the conviction none the less that its popularity was nothing more nor less than a high-brow pose. Certainly its presentation of Puritan character was an inexcusable travesty on reality. Oliver Alden, anæmic as he is, is still the best character in the book; but as a specimen of what the Puritan stock either was or is, he is nowhere recognizable. Pit him against the late Charles William Eliot, more than once described in his day as "the last of the Puritans," and you have a perfect measure of Santayana's betrayal of his theme. And Santayana knew Eliot and taught under him for years! What we have in this book, both in its writing and in its reading, is one more instance of the perversity of our generation in misjudging their forbears. The Puritans were not the solemn, sardonic, outwardly cruel and inwardly timid folk we think they were. They had not half the repressions and complexes from which we suffer today. They were a people of heroic fibre who, as Professor Hocking, of Harvard, pointed out in his address at the Williams College centenary, had a "capacity for seriousness" which was the fruit of a profound philosophy and an austere religion. It was this "capacity" which enabled the Puritans to open an era in history and lay the foundations of a civilization. Now in contrast stands our generation which is described by Professor Hocking as having a "habit of treating all things as if they were equally light." We are an empty, flippant, pleasure-seeking, and excitement-loving people who, through sheer lack of character, are ending an epoch instead of beginning one. Of course we feel our inferiority, our unworthiness, and thus instinctively build up a defense mechanism, of which contempt for those better than ourselves is the chief ingredient. *The Last Puritan* is a characteristic product of the times—made tolerable only by the author's apology for it in his introduction.

Jottings

It may be said of Father Coughlin, as of Charles II, "Nothing became him like his taking off."

A campaign circular which came to our attention called Governor Landon "the American Hitler." This characterization seems about as apt as the little boy's description of the family cat as "a tiger."

First prize for understatement in 1936 is hereby awarded to the New York *Herald-Tribune,* for the following editorial statement:

"France is the scene of a new struggle of extremists—a struggle not yet as *unreasonable* as in Spain."

Ask the hundreds blown up in the Alcazar, the thousands shot to death by firing squads, the raped women, the butchered priests, the massacred artisans and peasants, ask these bleeding victims and undoubtedly they will agree that this is "unreasonable" indeed!

". . . three alleged politicians."
New York *Herald-Tribune.*

So it is now libelous to call a man a "politician," and a newspaper must protect itself by that useful word "alleged." Well, why not, in view of the American political record?

". . . [Mussolini's] ambitions in southeastern Europe might easily bring him into conflict with Germany."
—*The New Republic.*

Here is the real solution of the European crisis—Let dog eat dog!

J. H. H.

The Embarrassment of Religious Liberalism

GEORGE YEISLEY RUSK

The outcome of the Fundamentalist controversy within the Protestant churches, the writer hopes, will be a profound searching for a discovery of the nature of religious differences and so of religion; that men will realize that they differ because there is a contradiction in the very structure of reality. Let us test this conclusion empirically.

The real animus of the attack of the Fundamentalists upon the Liberals who have remained within orthodoxy has been the conviction of the former that the latter disguise their real views in order to remain within the orthodox churches, and so to be in a position to teach clandestinely their real views as if they were the authorized views, and thus lead at least the children of the very elect astray. And the Liberals have felt that they did accept the orthodox creeds—all that was real and historically essential in them, and could gain an honest hearing for their formulation of these essentials only by maintaining their orthodox estate. In the face of scathing denunciation, the Liberals have declared: Paul began where the heathen were, to lead them to Christ; with equal honesty might *they* begin where the orthodox are, to lead them into liberalism. And, of course, any one who is accustomed to see all things in their essential logical nature must realize that both disputants are right. Given at any moment their initial positions, and speaking generally, both the Liberals and Conservatives have acted necessarily. Their conflict is tragic in the Aristotelian sense; that is, it is inevitable. Every man who takes a step deceives his friend with whom he has promised to take a walk, for he takes a step out ahead of his friend. But the deception becomes accentuated if the friend is also walking (and no man or movement ever has remained still)—but walking backwards—as the orthodox always are. For without formally denying the liberal, spiritual, universal verses of the Bible they increasingly press them into the mould of the most narrow. Meanwhile the Liberals reinterpret the narrow so as to mean the universal. Two cannot walk together for long unless they be agreed.

To the happy solution of present difficulties by separation there is only one essential difficulty. The Liberals cannot think of any independent theology to say that they hold. It is not merely that the Liberals as a group are not agreed among themselves. No individual Liberal can construct a theology logically satisfactory even to himself. Having enthroned reason and thereby overthrown dogma, the Liberals find that reason as a measure of the universe is like a broken stick which a child uses to touch the stars. The most important attempt to construct a modern theology—that of Albrecht Ritschl—has not, like the Calvinism represented by Holmes' *Wonderful One-Horse Shay* waited for a hundred years to be a "heap or a mound."

The situation which arises from a lack of a liberal theology would not be positively desperate if it were not for several facts: children, sin, frustration, and death. They are equally insistent. Children must be instructed. The sting of sin must be drawn. Life must know a final value in the knowledge of which is fulfillment. And faith must triumph over death. To achieve these ends the Liberals must have a theology. That is, they must make a final synthesis of experience—of all that we receive from the action of reason, emotion, will, and the deposit of will which is history. But this theology the Liberals cannot find. They cannot, because they use pure reason to do so and reason is necessarily self-contradictory—as has been known since the beginning of philosophy with Zeno to the climax of science in Einstein. Even when with Ritschl the Liberals reject theology, they use reason to construct a new one—a pale, anæmic thing, but sufficient to prevent the adoption of anything better. The only positive belief that reason has left the Liberal is that which it left to Aristotle and to Hegel,—process, evolution, progress. Therefore, when the Liberals attempt to state their fundamental beliefs they are forced to be like the man who wrote a book entitled: *The Nature and Immutability of Truth,* prefixed by a sketch of the origin and progress of this work.

In view of these facts, what can the Liberals do? They can do what science and education at their best are doing. They can think of religion as a project made up of smaller projects, but no one of its results absolute, absorbing the realities with which it deals—as pragmatism consistently but foolishly claims that projects do. We need not stop to insist that education increasingly thinks of itself so, but perhaps it is necessary that we show that science does, at least *when it is truly scientific.*

True science is always practical. It takes a principle of correlation, for instance, cause, purpose, function—biological or conscious—and seeks the facts which can be brought into unity by the principle in hand. When the correlation is complete, science stops. Its project is done. It does not attempt completely to express the fact in the formula, certainly not to express the fact in any logical derivative of the formula. It is not intellectualistic, as theology tends to be. Science takes account only of *some* elements in the material which it organizes; that is, of those which can be organized by the principle which it is using. Therefore its findings *are* abstract, but abstract in the good sense of the word. But being abstract in the *good* sense, the findings are objectively true. That is, they claim for any science the parts or aspects of facts, and those alone, which really belong to the science by virtue of its organizing principle; or, in other words, by virtue of the project which the organizing principle enables one to carry out. Thus, for instance, introspective psychology teaches us to distinguish reason from will with great refinement; behaviorism, to devise the proper environment for children; and functionalism, to appreciate the mother's love for her infant. Thus no one of the sciences is merely subjective. All are objective, adequate, true—so far as they claim that they go.

Religion, however, has tended to claim that it exhausts its material in its organization of the material because both religion and its material are

mental, not mental and physical, as are respectively the organization and material of science. The various organizations therefore coalesce with their material and so the various theologies are regarded as absolute. But since *none is* exhaustive of its material, absolute, *each is* false in claiming to be more than the application of a principle of correlation to the facts accepted as true on the basis of previous experience and the activity of organizing mind, but facts ever refined as made use of by successive projects.

Liberal religion should proceed by the same method as does science. Its final project should be the redemption of man, i.e., the freeing him from ennui, superficiality, fear, and outraged conscience. It should differ from the sciences: (1) only in not limiting its material, as the special sciences must,—except that in carrying out its special project of redemption it should regard the spiritual as its field and the material as such also only in so far as it is the realm in which in our present experience spirit reveals itself and which influences spirit; and (2) in being free to use any method—teleology, cause, function, and the rest, provided it does not confuse them formally. The reason religion is free from strict limitation of material and method is that it is the universal subject—the mother of all the arts and sciences.

Liberal religion must be willing to embrace all the concrete projects valuable for its final end which it cannot find specialized community agencies willing to sponsor. Religion is the guardian of all the interests of mankind. It is her duty as her glory to do as well as she can whatever others dare not attempt at all.

But even where, as in a great city, every interest has its specialized professionals, religion has still a great function—the coordinating and ruling of all the special interests. The artists it must keep moral if their art does not do so. The moralist it must liberalize. To the mother bent over immediate household tasks it must tell something of the vast spaces of the stars, if nature has not already caused her to correct her myopia. In the astronomer it must kindle the fire of immediate human interests, if mental hygiene has not done so. With the poet it must sing, but not for art's sake but for life's sake. With the physician it must heal, but not only for physical comfort, or further dissipation, but for a life of service. In a word, it must encourage all human interests, but when men in eager devotion to a special truth deny the whole of truth, it must gently invite them to bathe in the gushing fountain of all truth and so renew their whole spirits. The statements which it makes about God—that is, its theology—should be the truths which it is necessary to hold of ultimate reality in order to carry out these projects—nothing more nor less. Predestination, free will, governmental theory of the atonement, supernatural eschatology, all, only so far as they serve and create human redemption.

If Liberalism were completely to renounce intellectualism, and consciously set the proposed projects before its face, using intellectual analysis only in their service, it would conquer its present embarrassment, speak with clearness a redeeming message to mankind, and at last know that it had found the truth of which the most refined metaphysics could not despoil it. It would discover that God *is* that which man most sorely needs, the One in whom man finds the ultimate renewing of his essential life. Such a God it will not be possible to lay out in an orderly manner—as for a coffin, but he will be The Living One, mighty to save, and in no wise driving men to distraction by contradictory abstract imperatives. Therefore, there will be no absolute with which priests can scourge believers. . . . Great Pan is dead. Yet the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth for ever and ever. Amen.

How the preceding denial of consistency but also of absolutes because inconsistent, with resulting denial and affirmation of God, can be reconciled in a formula —it is the height of arrogance to inquire. One can only realize the reconciliation in balanced living. At times one may need ontological support for the categorical imperative to holy living in general as underpinning for some hard moral decision in the concrete, which is afforded only by an intellectual argument for the being of God. Anything can find support ultimately only by its opposite; for instance: the moral by the ontological, the specific by the general. At times one needs a mystical intuition of the Whole, achieved through music, triumphing amid great art, or embodied in an imperishable figure of speech. At times one needs specific instruction from the lips of those (priests or laymen) who know and have realized through their being the final Unity-in-diversity by which to correct a now evident aberrancy of one's own. But at best, one needs nothing, for he has all. Then he walks the ways of the spirit, as we do those of earth; that is, by the contradiction of being upborne by the stones which give way under our feet, stones composed of electrons relatively more distant from each other than are the stars in their circuits. So we are upborne, restrained by the truths we follow, and thus are prevented from following them to our destruction. But at the same time and in balanced measure the truths also yield to our impulse by the very fact that we follow them. By the truth we are freed, restrained, sustained.

If the final truth of theology is thus self-contradiction, and specifically renders the services of the clergy of uncertain, fluctuating value, although not of no value at all, no wonder the religious liberals cannot discover a specific system of theology which they may claim they hold, and so stand before the world deeply embarrassed, certain only that they will not return to the dogmatisms of the past. But realization of their situation will give them the only true theology there is, keep them employed on essential personal and social projects, and will inspire them by the thrilling unity of spiritual experience.

A Modern Credo

The authority of evidence
The supremacy of intelligence
The leadership of competence
The validity of freedom
The goal of commonweal.

—*Curtis W. Reese.*

Religion in Russia—Word and Deed

VICTOR S. YARROS

Every one knows, of course, that the Russian government and the Russian intellectuals are atheists or agnostics, and that the word religion is *never* on their lips, save for purposes of ridicule and contempt. The Russian Bolsheviks hold that religion is mostly superstition, fable, myth, not to say nonsense, encouraged by crafty priests in the interest of the powerful and wealthy. In an address at an important gathering a noted Chicago educator called the Russian government a "Godless crew" and was loudly cheered.

But we should bear in mind that, as some one has said, ninety per cent of the controversies of the world are due to misunderstanding, to differences, unacknowledged and unexplained, in the use of terms.

The writer of this article has recently visited Moscow and Leningrad and has seen, heard, and read many interesting things in those Russian centers. He has heard sneers at religion and seen the Anti-Religious Museum at Moscow. None of the men and women he interviewed or cross-examined—the latter is the right word—liked to be told that they were "religious," or that religion had anything to do with their way of life, their devotion to the cause of Communism, or their ideals and ideas. Some of them, however, knew that many western European and American radicals found *no* inconsistency between Socialism or Communism and their Christian faith—nay, more asserted with entire sincerity that their religious convictions led them to repudiate Capitalism and Laissez-Faireism and embrace the Communist gospel. They were tolerant toward that attitude, though they frankly admitted that it seemed to them rather naive and sentimental. One of them recalled Lenin's answer to the charge of George Lansbury of England, that Bolshevism needlessly antagonized essential Christianity—the Christianity not of the churches and the pedantic theologians, but of Jesus and his true followers—"George, go home and convert your English public to that type of Christianity, *then* come back and talk to *us* about our treatment of religion."

The Russian Communists may be a "Godless crew" —and what are the Agnostics of Europe and America? —but some good Christian missionaries have pointed out that there is more essential Christianity in the Russian system and the Russian policies, domestic and foreign, than in all the capitalist and bourgeois systems of the world. Is there anything Godless, or irreligious, in the idea of abundance for all, in old-age pensions, in insurance against unemployment, in the concept of production for use instead of for private profit, in complete equality of men and women, in effective protection of children's health, in extending educational opportunities in city and village, in recognizing the state's obligation to give work to every human being capable of work and to require work of every such individual, and in taking all possible steps to prevent waste in industry and in life?

After all, what is essential Christianity, or essential Judaism, or essential Buddhism? Whether you read the Old Testament or the New, the Western prophets or the Eastern, the modern humanists or the old, what definition of religion do we find in these passionate and eloquent teachings? Does not Micah speak for *all* the Hebrew prophets—as Miss Edith Hamilton affirms he does——when he tells us that all that religion requires of us is to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly? What does Jesus say on the same subject? And what St. James? And what Buddha?

Be just, be charitable, love your neighbor, help him in his need, cultivate a spirit of modesty and simplicity —this is the essence of *any religion* not synonymous with superstition and empty dogma.

True, we are enjoined in the Scriptures to love God as well as our fellow men, but, as Matthew Arnold pointed out long ago, we finite and limited and ignorant beings can do nothing, directly, for God. We cannot even form a faint notion of God. We use the term glibly, but we attach no real meaning to it. The notion of pleasing God by singing his praises is of course childish. It is clear from the context that even those prophets who emphasized the love of God thought of service and unselfishness *as the only real way of manifesting love of God.*

Russia is seeking and working to build up a commonwealth on the basis of service, equality, fraternity, and genuine individual liberty. The government has no other aim or purpose. There is in Russia no worship of a mystical, totalitarian, authoritarian State. There has been a dictatorship of the Communist party—a party dedicated to the ideals of all the social prophets. We may dislike dictatorships, and we may condemn force as a means of social reconstruction. We may prefer gradualness, evolution to revolution and coercion. But all these things are irrelevant to the central issue—the issue, namely, whether the system, the way of life, the laws and institutions being promoted in Russia by the Communists, are irreligious and Godless.

The Russian intellectuals know that Russia has never been Christian. It has been pagan and superstitious. Its Christianity has meant nothing in the policies of the government and of the privileged class. The Communists have not "exterminated Christianity," since you cannot exterminate that which never existed. They have fought superstition and the misuse of what has been called religion. Today they are, so far as deeds and plans and ideals are concerned, infinitely better Christians than those who, without living and practising *a single commandment* of their master, persist in calling themselves Christians. Neither their real faith nor their conduct is Christian. It is, therefore, no paradox to say that he or she who *believes* in Christian doctrines should go to Russia and there watch the heroic efforts to translate those doctrines into a way of life, individual and social.

Tolerance

Let me have faith, is what I pray,
  And let my faith be strong—
But who am I, is what I say
  To think my neighbor wrong?

And though my neighbor may deny
  True faith could be so slight,
May call me wrong, yet who am I
  To think my neighbor right?

We may discover by and by
  Making our wisdom double,
That he is right and so am I—
  And save a lot of trouble.

Witter Bynner.

Who Shall Tell Us What to Drink?

MRS. MARGARET C. MUNNS*

A pleasant young gentleman tells the radio audience what to eat. He is a dietitian, duly accredited, and there are countless others. They have acquainted us with calories, vitamins, proteins, the balanced meal, and what not, besides. Who tells us what to drink?

White-coated Dr. Carrel-looking fellows in laboratories connected with the great universities, the great medical schools, the great clinics, and the great research bureaus have been studying that question for a very considerable time, and they have arrived at conclusions. Do these conclusions reach the public? No, but behold what does!

Open almost any newspaper or the magazine you pick up on the train, or glance at the many, many posters, and you learn that the proper beverage is alcohol.

As to the particular form of alcohol, instructions differ. Some prescribe beer. It is "good for you." It provides "the vigor of youth." It keeps women slender—aren't the women in the pictures all sylphs? Other instructions prescribe whiskey. It gives one a "clear head." At forty, one "feels like thirty"; at sixty, one "feels like forty." Fine old gentlemen are shown advising their sons to drink whiskey. Still other instructions prescribe gin, rum, brandy, and the various wines, but on one point all agree. Alcohol is humanity's best friend. Look closer at the people in the pictures. See how healthy they are, how handsome, how prosperous, how fashionable! Q. E. D.

Some wonderful ingenuity has gone into this vast "educational" campaign and some not so wonderful. "An Open Letter to the Women of America on Whiskey" turned out to have been a mistake. But let that pass. Consider instead the marvelously developed art of saying things without saying them. Here, in a picture, stands a locomotive engineer, remarking, "All up and down the line ————'s whiskey is preferred." The gullible are not told that engineers drink, yet the impression is given that engineers do drink. Still cleverer is the device of telling people not to drink and at the same time coaxing them to. "We advise moderation," says an advertisement. "Steer clear of that 'one glass too many'." A pure stroke of genius, this. No drinker ever yet avoided the "one glass too many" because of an advertisement, and that same advertisement went on to praise whiskey. To the gullible it said in effect, "Try our bully good stuff. Of course you won't ever go to excess. All your life you will be unfailingly moderate."

Does it strike you that the vast "educational" campaign must be costing a considerable lot of money? According to the *Editor and Publisher*, the appropriation for this year's liquor advertising totals $25,000,000. And observe! That enormous sum is not being expended in urging drinkers to drink, it is being expended in urging non-drinkers to drink, and the liquor interests concentrate their efforts mainly upon women and the young. They own up to this quite frankly in their trade publications.

Note, too, their acknowledged long-range purpose. By getting us all to drink, they hope to build up a voting public solidly opposed to any sort of liquor reform.

Toward these objectives they seem to have progressed, so far, at something of a gallop. Already we behold an amazingly increased percentage of women patients at sanatoria for alcoholics, an amazingly increased percentage of young people rejected for life insurance because of alcoholism, and an amazingly increased number of accidents occasioned by drinking drivers.

That the vast campaign should have succeeded so brilliantly is not altogether remarkable. The facts about alcohol used to be taught in the public schools; when prohibition came, such instruction ceased, and it has not been resumed. Meanwhile, as victory seemed won, temperance organizations lost membership, lost revenue, and were forced to abridge their educational work. Thus a generation has grown up ignorant as to the facts about alcohol and, therefore, at the mercy of imposture. Nor is this by any means the whole story. The older set, seeing liquor made suddenly legal, appeared to conclude that at the same time it had been made "perfectly all right," and so began a carnival of drinking, since intensified by rebound from the depression. It is not an edifying spectacle today and it is not bright with promise for the future.

Why, then, should we go on allowing the liquor interests alone to tell America what to drink when obviously more disinterested suggestions can be obtained from the white-coated, Dr. Carrel-looking gentlemen in laboratories connected with the great universities, the great medical schools, the great clinics, and the great research bureaus? Without a dissenting voice, they declare alcohol a dangerous, habit-forming narcotic best left alone.

To make the laboratory idea of alcohol common property everywhere, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is raising a fund of $1,000,000. No part of that sum will be spent for administrative or legislative purposes. It is for temperance education only. It will finance road signs and lectures, radio and films, newspaper articles and magazine articles, exhibits at fairs and exhibits at conventions. It will carry temperance education not only into the churches and the schools, but into Parent Teachers Associations, women's clubs, the business and fraternal organizations, and especially the colleges.

There will be no "coloring" of the facts, no moralizing or exhorting. Take it or leave it, here is knowledge acquired by patient, unbiased, trained investigators whose sole motive has been a desire to come at truth. Temperance education seeks only to pass that knowledge on. Call it university extension, if you like. In spirit and in breadth of technique, it is precisely that, and I do not at the moment recall that any branch of university extension was ever so imperatively needed.

*Chairman, National Temperance Education Fund Committee.—Editors.

Christian Refugees from Germany

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The German refugee problem is getting steadily worse. A regime in the Reich which it was once believed must become more sane and sober with passing time has only become more ruthless. Freedom is at an end in Germany for years, perhaps for decades, to come. A tyranny rapt in fanaticism, disciplined to cruelty and sustained by a philosophy which is a veritable mania of unreason, is definitely set to the extirpation of all dissenting groups and all heretical persons. Not even in the people of Germany, as distinct from the government, is hope any longer to be found. For these multitudes, through teaching and terror, precept and propaganda, have been carried over into a veritable medieval state of mind. These men and women no longer think or act as citizens of the modern world, but rather as savage denizens of the Dark Ages. What we see in this tragic country, under the rule of the Nazis, is the recrudescence of *the horde.* Our own civilization, as Macauley suggested long ago, has bred the barbarians who now threaten to destroy our world as the Vandals destroyed the Roman Empire.

The Jews of Germany were the ones to endure the initial impact of this horror. Singled out as an alien and inferior people, to be repressed and ultimately destroyed as a condition of the racial purity of the Aryans, these Jews have suddenly been visited with such persecutions as the world has not seen for centuries. Says the Bishop of Durham, in his introduction to *The Yellow Spot,* a collection of facts and documents relating to three years of persecution of German Jews, "I find it difficult to discover in the records of persecution, many and somber as they are, anything quite equivalent to the persecution of the Jews which now proceeds in Germany. The nearest parallel is the persecution of the early Christians by the pagan empire of Rome."

It is the completeness of this tragedy, coupled with the wrath of Jews in other countries against such outrage and their sacrificial generosity in meeting its consequences, which has made the German refugee problem appear to be exclusively a Jewish problem. It is true that the overwhelming majority of refugees from the Reich have been Jews. Fleeing from a condition which has been reluctantly accepted as permanent and thus as dooming the Jews in Germany to extinction within a generation, some 80,000 men, women, and children of Israel have left their homes and are now seeking foothold in other lands. It is an incredibly pitiful spectacle, not matched since the expulsion of the Huguenots from France.

But Jews are not the only refugees! There are Christians as well in this great pouring flood of misery. For, as the Nazi terror has strengthened its hold upon the nation, it has steadily widened the area of its desolation. At the very start, all non-Nazi professors in the universities, more of them Gentiles than Jews, were ousted from their chairs, and left to fend miserably for themselves. Some 2,000 distinguished scholars and teachers have thus suffered, many of whom have fled abroad for safety. In the same way, Gentile pacifists, liberals, radicals, all men and women of open minds and progressive spirits in politics, journalism, and the professions, were hunted and harried in their homes and at last driven from their wonted ways of life. Then came the attack upon the churches, both Catholic and Protestant, with an ever mounting tide of priests and pastors, and even laymen, hounded from their altars, and at last hurled in flight beyond the nation's frontiers. Always there have been Christians involved in one way or another in mixed marriages with Jews, who have straightway had to suffer the disability and humiliations of the Jews themselves. It is estimated that there are today not less than 14,000 Christian refugees from Germany. Of these, 2,000 are absolutely penniless, and the remaining 12,000 are rapidly becoming penniless. Gathered in refugee camps along the borders, or scattered in such cities as Brussels, Paris, London, these people are becoming desperate. They know not where to go, nor what to do.

It is to the everlasting glory of the Jews in England, France, and especially America, that they have helped these Christian refugees, almost without distinction from those of their own blood. There is supreme irony in the fact that more than one frightened Gentile refugee has claimed to be a Jew, that he might the more readily and surely obtain the assistance so desperately needed by himself and his family. *But what of the Christians all this time,* the Christians of the world outside of Germany? What of the millions of Protestants in our own country, for example—what have *they* been doing to lend aid and comfort to their brethren? What have they been doing, for that matter, to help the Jews in their incredible distress? It is to me an occasion of reproach and shame that the Christians of America should not have risen up to the aid of these stricken German Jews, as they rose up years ago, I well recall, to the aid of the stricken Armenians of Turkey. Are we Levites or Samaritans as we pass by these wretched victims of Nazi terror lying half-dead by the roadside of the world? But I would not press this point in this place. I am speaking on behalf of Christians, members of our own religious household, whose appeal is a command upon our hands and hearts. For these we have done as yet nothing worthy to be mentioned in the same breath with the vast and sacrificial labors of Israel.

Now the opportunity has come! In the American Christian Committee for German Refugees, organized with headquarters in New York (287 Fourth Avenue), Dr. Frank Ritchie, Secretary, we have a group prepared to act in this tragic and terrible emergency. The need is not only great but immediate. These Christian refugees from Germany must be fed and housed and clothed. Then their problems must be studied, their transportation to new homes planned and paid for, their introduction to new self-supporting activities provided for. Only a small proportion of these refugees, perhaps 2,000, can become colonists in agricultural areas in South America and elsewhere. The rest must be placed in arts and trades and professions. This is slow and costly work. And all the while it is going on, other thousands of Christian refugees will be crossing the German border and crying out for help. At any time a swift turning of the screws in Germany, a pressing of the religious war so long threatened, may lead to such an exodus of miserable Gentiles, both Catholic and Protestant, that even the tide of Jewish misery will for the moment at least be overborne. This is a continuing and thus a continuous problem. It is like the work of mercy in war time. As long as the fighting goes on, the Red Cross must be at

the front. In the same way, as long as the Nazi tyranny prevails, the Cross of Christ must be lifted in succor and shelter of its own.

The American Christian Committee for German Refugees will soon be launching its nation-wide campaign for funds. To its appeal there must be given generous answer in the spirit of the strong bearing the burdens of the weak.

The Women's Congress in Salzburg

ELLEN HÖRUP

On my way to the Women's Congress in Salzburg I spent half a day in Munich. The military parade in Nurnberg was being shown at the cinema. It was a splendid propaganda film in which Hitler, Goebbels, and Goering took turns in throwing shibboleths like bombs to the masses.

First came men in rank and file with spades: "You are the workers of Germany but you are soldiers besides." There was no mistaking it. From interminable rows—a sea of "Heil, Hitler" arms, spades gleaming like guns over their shoulders, heels clicked together. It resembled a giant carpet with a uniform pattern and sold by the mile.

Next came the march past, handed down from the days of the Kaiser, where the lords of creation now make themselves ridiculous in honor of Hitler, as they formerly did in honor of the Kaiser, by flinging their legs out horizontally instead of walking. Then followed the shadow march in which the whole army most effectively walks in its own shade. Banners, uplifted hands, boots, set mask-like faces, mechanical people ready to carry out any murderous or suicidal order without moving a muscle. "You are the first. The most faithful of the faithful." Automatic cheering!

Finally came the boys, fair blue-eyed children with soft-skinned, wondering faces. Drums and banners. Hitler on the platform. "We shall pass away, but you will remain. In you Germany will live. Through you Germany will march on to the Germany that will come after you."

It was a demonstration not of people but of human material.

The proudest achievement of the state has become a military machine. Its object is to crush other military machines. Human society is steering toward that goal. People's work is directed toward that aim. Mental and manual work, science, technology, discoveries, machines, agriculture, all social progress is leading toward the same goal: the preparation of the military machine, and that, in the interests of the military machine, the country shall be self-supporting.

Thus far has the rule of men brought human society. This is the state which male shrewdness has taken thousands of years to prepare and improve, which the great men have fashioned as the basis for the steady, further development of every human being's right to life. It is our present civilization.

When women are confined, it is not merely children but human material they bring into the world. The state demands it: the Fascist, the Nazist, the Bolshevist, all the dictator states, and more or less all the democratic ones, too.

But what do women demand?

Judging by their associations, they may be divided into two groups, political and feminist. The former group is Fascist or Communist, and is a branch of the class-war. "Hand in hand with the men we will fight for our rights," say they. They starve when there is a strike, they suffer twice as much if they are self-supporting. The working-class women believe in the attainment of their righteous demands by the help of a social revolution and a different economic system. Hitherto, however, the workers' fight within the capitalist system has been waged almost exclusively by the men and for the men. No labor government has passed laws securing to women anything like the same wages as men for the same work. Woman still represents cheap labor and under-cut wages.

The feminists are different. They have the franchise, equality, peace, and freedom inscribed on their banners. They are recruited from all groups and classes of society. They stand together as a sex. Apart from their political attitude, they fight for the equal rights of women against the domination of the men, against the men who withhold from them their rights.

The Congress in Salzburg was a feminist congress. The majority of those taking part maintained that woman, through her natural gifts and qualities and her natural functions as a mother and a person, had a special mission to fulfill. Had she been able to make her influence upon society felt in all spheres, its progress would have been guided in other and better directions. A few even thought that she was entitled to greater influence than man and this called forth vehement opposition from others. During a private talk before the Congress, the difference between these two points of view was very apparent.

The one, maintaining the right of woman to be the leader, brought forward as proof the propagation of the family—man's exceedingly small share here could not possibly entitle him to set himself up as lord over the female sex. It would have been far more in agreement with the significance of the two sexes in propagation if woman had been predominant in the state.

"We who hate dictatorship and injustice, we ought therefore to become dictators like the men!" exclaimed an old American eye-specialist, who had studied in Germany, practised in New York, and was one of the leaders of the women's movement in Asia. "We ought to commit the same injustices as those under which we are now suffering! We, who are against privileges and prerogatives, we ought to introduce them to our own advantage if we get the power to do so! Never as long as I live will I agree to that!! I want equal rights, absolute and without any kind of humbug. *But nothing more than that.*"

The other, a delegate from one of the dictator states, then took the field with science. Science had shown that the blood contained more female hormones than male and that the female hormones were constructive while the male were destructive: an indication of how the government of human society ought to be apportioned.

Then the old doctor laughed: "Science! This much I do know about science, a scientific truth lives for

twenty years at the most. And now in honor of that truth I am to leave the line I have followed all my life, the line of justice and equality? No thanks, I'm not counting any hormones."

Many were opposed to marriage. One of them, a beautiful young woman from Jugo-Slavia, told me about the birth of her child one Christmas Eve out in the country where there was no help obtainable, no doctor, no midwife, no nurse. She could never forget what she went through then. Now she was divorced. "But I hope you have retained the child?" "It's with my husband," she said smiling. I looked surprised. She laughed: "I let myself be divorced because I'm opposed to marriage, but I now live in concubinage with my divorced husband."

* * *

There were three topics on the program of this Congress: the Reform of the League of Nations, the Labor Army, and Land Reform.

The first point regarding the League of Nations reform runs: "The sovereignty and authority of the state to be limited by a league of nations and no country to rule over another. The most important hypothesis for a real league of nations, the disarmament of all countries." But when once one had got so far, then one could easily see the way to the league of nations becoming a world parliament with a world government and a world tribune. A different economic system is a condition of this reform as well as for a Labor Army. Hence, both topics remained in the air, since the question of the substitution of another economic system for the capitalist one was not taken up.

The third topic was Land Reform. The founder of the Fogelstad School, Froken von Tamm, explained how speculation in land is conditional upon the present form of ownership. If speculation is to be avoided, and this is an important matter for both the individual and the masses, then another form must be introduced. The Congress formed and passed a resolution which agreed in all essentials with the Swedish: The land should belong to the community, and the tenant be able to have it for an unlimited period as an inherited lease. The sale of the rights to use it should only take place under state control. There should be a maximum and minimum limit to the size of the property. The state should fix the price of the buildings and decide the amount of land to be used for building. In Sweden the law gives landowners the right to apply this system. Froken von Tamm is one of the few who have done so.

In addition, the Congress expressed sympathy with "The Open Door" and the so-called Montevideo agreement on equal rights and the establishment of political schools for women in all countries.

On one of the last days, a Swedish member propounded her views of society under the rule of men. From another direction she came to the same conclusion as the feminists who believe in the special mission of women.

By means of an intimate association with nature, she herself had obtained firm convictions and understood mankind's place within "the great sacred unanimity of the universe." She dreamed of a kingdom where freedom, justice, peace, and beauty reigned, but she soon discovered that men's ideals always ended the same way. They drowned in blood and vanished in the financial melting pot. Men were always ready to offer themselves for the state, their party, science, the family, and not themselves alone but everything else both living and dead.

It is the right of ownership that under men's rule has got such an upper hand that men now trample regardlessly upon life itself. The right of ownership was once man's shadow but now, as in the Hans Andersen fairy tale, it has become independent and personified itself in the state, making man its slave. Man has turned death into his religion and the oblation into a sacred action.

Woman stands poor and naked in man's suicidal kingdom.

Her work is to produce life, to nourish life, to protect life.

Man is on the march towards barbarism, for civilization means respect for life.

What Is Was Meant To Be

BY A YOUNG GIRL IN THE HILLS OF KENTUCKY

A new dress was an unheard of event except at meeting-time. If a girl had a new dress as often as every other meeting-time, folks said her family was scared she couldn't marry or they wouldn't waste money dyking her up like that. About September we mentioned that we hadn't had a dress since July meeting-time a year ago. Even the poorest family did not send a girl to meeting in the same dress very much longer than a year. Once in a great while one would wear the same dress for two or three years and everybody would take notice and say she ought to hire out, that her family was getting too ornery for anything.

All of the community social life centered around meeting-time on the fourth Saturday and Sunday. In the fall we usually got to go to a few bean-stringings and stir-offs, but only a few families would harbor these carryings-on of the young people, and we never knew when they would get talked about. We could count on meeting-time; it was as sure as death and taxes, and in many ways as nerve-wrecking. Everybody that was anybody scoured the floors and woodwork with sand when getting ready for meeting-time. Our house was full of dirty-fingered younguns and we had to include the hickory chairs and white poplar table legs in the scouring. It wasn't in good taste to have too many dresses, so a lot of imagination went into crocheted collars and made-over hats.

The Saturday meeting was mostly given over to church members and they were all family men and women. Sunday was the big day. If the weather was nice, people would come from miles around and the preaching would be moved to the grove. The benches in the grove were made of plank, like those in the meeting house, but the exposure made them dirtier. In summer we always took two handkerchiefs; one to sit on if we went to the grove.

If a girl wasn't awfully homely or had a bad burn she had a fellow by the time she was fourteen. Unless they were to be married soon, she saw him

at meeting-time only. If he lived within six miles he called for her at home. If he lived five miles above the meeting-house and she lived five or six miles below, they met there and he walked home with her. They would go for a walk in the afternoon, and about eight-thirty he would start to walk back home.

Sometimes two girls we knew on the Cane Patch would come to spend Saturday-meeting-night with us. We would sleep upstairs and whisper and cram the bedclothes in our mouths to keep from giggling out loud. Pa could hear a cat snoring in a beehive and was always having something to say about us breaking his rest. We wouldn't get to sleep before early in the morning, then we'd be fearful we couldn't wake up in time to help with the milking, clean the house, and be ready to leave for meeting by nine o'clock.

My sister always had a fellow, and the girls from the Cane Patch and I usually had one or two between us. They would come home with us, and we'd have a lot of fun trying to wheedle the boys into eating dinner. They'd swear they were not hungry, then finally come in and eat until we'd take up the last dishful and be scared they wouldn't push back their plates. Pa was always grumpy but we didn't pay him any mind if he didn't become so rude the visitors seemed to notice. Ma was always good-natured and laughed and told jokes with us.

When Ma was a girl the young women made grapevine hoops. She liked to tell about one girl who made a new set of hoops every meeting-time. She was jealous that someone would wear wider hoops than she, although all of the girls wore them as wide as they could, not to lift their skirts above the ankle—a short skirt was tacky and caused people to talk. This girl had a brother who was everlastingly into something. He slipped and cut the string holding her new hoops almost in two. She was walking up the road with her fellow and the hoops fell down around her feet in front of the whole meeting-crowd. She quit wearing hoops, although they didn't go out of fashion for a year or two. Ma would tell the story and laugh until she had to wipe her eyes with the corner of her apron.

After dinner we would walk a piece with the girls, four or five miles toward the Cane Patch.

We would be happy and excited, and when we got in bed Sunday night we wouldn't be able to go to sleep. We'd talk about the good time we had had and end with a discussion of the sermon we heard, and whether we had ever sinned or not. We had told Ma a few lies and Pa a lot of them, but we hadn't killed any one or even wanted to; at that, sin weighed heavily on our hearts. All of the things we liked best had been severely condemned by Brother Billie, the preacher. We couldn't picture ourselves floating in bliss but we could conjure lurid visions of howling in hell!

Our attendance at the Hard-Shell church offered slight consolation for sinners. They taught that praying was all a poor sinner could do and praying wouldn't do any good if the sinner had been predestinated to sizzle in hot brimstone forever and ever. The Soft-Shellers taught that one could pray oneself out of hell, but only a few of them lived in our community and they were not considered very bright.

In the Hard-Shell church, the "brethern" and "sistern" who had been chosen before time began, and could prove it by an experience in grace, sat up front. Brother Billie exhorted them to praise the Lord for having made them of the chosen few; and to not worry about their wild boys and girls—if meant for heaven, they would get there. Several men and women, known to have acepted the faith and not had an experience in grace, sat behind the chosen few and wept when Brother Billie spat forth flames of the hell created for Soft-Shellers, and those not chosen to wash in the blood of the lamb. The meeting would close with brother somebody pitching the tune to "Amazing Grace, How Sweet Thy Sound," and there would be shouting and more weeping. The chosen few would clap their hands and embrace the faithful, praying that their eyes might open, if it was meant to be.

My sister decided to get married and become one of those fortunate people who can shed sin—she didn't seem to care whether we were meant for heaven or hell. Our mortal fear subsided, we talked more and more about worldly desires. The doctrine of "what is, was meant to be" seemed cruel when applied to our everyday living. We worked hard in the fields, but the timber had all been sold to "the company" and there was no new ground. A short dry spell baked the clay ground as hard as a flint-rock and a few days rain washed all of the top soil into the creeks. When discouraged, Pa would say, "I tell you the land in this country is wore out. It shore looks like pore people is agoin to starve to death and go naked."

Coal mines had been opened ten or fifteen miles across the mountains. Young men were going down to the mines and being brought back dead. Most of them had married our girls and had two, three, or more children. The girl's Pa would fetch her and the children home, and she'd eke out a living, hoeing corn in the summer, and washing and caring for the sick in the winter.

Old Mr. Ward, who had been to the Legislature and was educated, tried to help some of the women get money from "the company." He made several trips to the county seat and said trying wasn't worth while. There was no law about it unless the woman sued "the company" and got a judgment. And when a judgment was won, the Judge, who had money in the mines, would place the judgment aside. An appeal to a higher court cost money and none of the women had money. Everybody wondered why this should be and some said they didn't believe no such was meant to be. Brother Billie preached sermon after sermon about "it was meant to be." He said when "the company" killed a mule they had to buy another one and when they killed a man all they had to do was to hire another one, and if it hadn't been meant to be, why was it so simple for "the company." No one could understand why it was so simple for "the company," but they all agreed it didn't look right; and Brother Billie would sort of waver in his doctrine when he had to preach a miner's funeral.

The change took place so rapidly we did not realize what was happening. We seemed to wake up one morning and the mines had come up to the

men; electric motors were replacing the mules, and a man was worth almost as much as a motor. No one had shot the Judge, as every one said some one ought to, but some one had killed his decisions, and "the company" had to pay compensation to the wives and children.

Foreigners lived in the mining camps and we sold them our garden stuff and eggs. We enjoyed the friendly foreigners, especially the women who could not speak our language and would hold up fingers and make clever signs for the eggs or turnips they wanted to buy and the price they would pay. They talked about a war in Europe being responsible for the high prices. The majority of us didn't know where Europe was and the others didn't care—we were buying store things and getting along fine. Books had appeared in the community; and Brother Billie preached a rousing sermon on the evils of novel reading. But he didn't stop the girls from shedding delightful tears over the lovelorn ladies of Laura Jean Libby and Mrs. E. D. E. N. Southworth.

We heard about America entering the war, and, before we knew what to make of it, the draft law was taking our boys away. Boys here and there tried to hide in the woods and the country was full of swaggering deputy sheriffs, wearing cartridge belts fastened on the hip by an ugly-looking pistol holster. One of the boys was murdered within sight of his home. A great sadness and fear hung over the community like a dark cloud, and old friends and relatives started meeting-time visits again. Money to spend and the friendly foreigners had got us out of the habit of depending on meeting-time to break the loneliness.

Brother Billie prayed for American soldiers to win the war. Then, after the boys had been gone several months, he suddenly changed his prayer. He had seen a vision, he said, and the war wouldn't end until all the soldiers, white, black and brown, crawled out of the trenches, shook hands and agreed to live and let live; that the Lord had commanded and the war was meant to be, in order that all men might become brothers.

Word got around that Brother Billie was preaching on the war, and crowds grew until they overflowed to the grove in sunny weather. Brother Billie was getting old and was quite feeble but he managed somehow to ride a horse on the fourth Saturday and Sunday, and deliver a stirring sermon on his new no-hell doctrine. The experience in grace was no longer required to enter heaven, and the chosen and the faithful had become one. The meeting ended with inspired shouting, and some weeping, from habit. There was so much to shout about and so little to weep about when Brother Billie waved his arms and bobbed his little old bald head up and down like a cork and shouted, "The joke will be on the Devil; he won't have a hell left to stand in when the people learn to stay out of war."

The Study Table

Fascism or Socialism?

AFTER THE NEW DEAL, WHAT? *By Norman Thomas. 244 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.00.*

Norman Thomas' latest book, *After the New Deal, What?*, is a simple and clear-cut analysis of the economics of the New Deal and the social forces working to bring about change—either Fascism or Socialism, he will not forecast which.

"Our fathers gave us a heritage of power-driven machinery and with it laid upon us the necessity to use it to conquer poverty or to be destroyed by it," says the author, pointing his finger at the root evil in our present economic system. Whether these tremendous powers of production are socialized for the good of all or whether they are allowed to enslave men so that a few men have too much and many men are unemployed and destitute in the face of plenty will decide if we shall have a "rendezvous with destiny" or doom. The New Deal, Fascism, and Socialism are analyzed in relation to this fundamental problem.

The author's lack of dogmatism may surprise some who expect Socialists always to parrot Marx. Of very few things is the author absolutely sure, not even that Socialism will ever get a chance in America or that Fascism is our inexorable fate. He *is* positive of two things about the New Deal, namely, that the New Deal cannot eradicate the evils produced by the private control of power production and that the New Deal cannot prevent Fascism.

The New Deal is ineffective, he argues, because it cannot control production and prevent its destroying purchasing power. The profit motive in control of production puts a premium upon the substitution of electric and steam power for human power and this leaves men unemployed and without purchasing power. No palliatives such as doles and subsidies are able to offset the loss. This imbalance of production and consumption is the basic contradiction in the capitalist system and was first pointed out by Marx. The New Deal seeking as it does to patch up rather than to eradicate defects in the capitalist system cannot solve the problem of balancing production and consumption. Furthermore, the New Deal cannot prevent Fascism because it cannot prevent wars and catastrophic depressions, the onset of either of which will produce American Fascism.

The author's reasoning concerning Fascism and Socialism runs about as follows: Fascism, no more than the New Deal, can conquer power production because Fascism is merely capitalism in extremis. Fascism is a defense of the status quo enforced by violence and dictatorship. It is the expression of the fear felt by the middle class because of their own insecurity and leads them to strike out against organized workers as well as the big bankers and industrialists. By forcing lower wages upon the workers and thereby further depleting their purchasing power, Fascism tends actually to intensify the defects of capitalism by creating a greater hiatus between production and consumption.

Socialism is the only way out because it is the only system which attempts to subordinate power production to human beings. Socialism means the social ownership of the principal means of production. Under Socialism the profits of power production now taken and

held by a few would be thrown back to the workers of hand and brain, which include most of the middle class, in the form of higher wages and salaries. Thus, purchasing power would be increased and mass purchasing power made to equal mass production, and the fundamental adjustment needed in economic life would be accomplished.

But there is only a fighting chance that Socialism can be achieved and Fascism deflected. There are certain forces working toward Socialism. The question is whether they can become effective before war and depression descend again upon America.

Among the constructive forces are (1) consumer cooperatives. They offer a valuable training school for the new loyalties and the new ideals necessary to a new society. (2) There are also the trade unions. The new organizational activities, especially the C.I.O. which organizes an industry from top to bottom in one union, may be more important in the long run than presidential campaigns. (3) Farmers and workers are joining together in political activity in their own party to serve their own interests, which are in the main Socialistic. (4) There is a possibility of unity among liberals although at the present time the Socialists and Communists are widely separated by tactics and program because the Socialists reject the Communistic pattern of a bureaucratic party controlled from the top; the interpretation of internationalism based on Russian concepts and interests; the emphasis on dictatorship and necessity of violence, and the willingness of the Communists to join in a European war on the side of Russia.

These forces are all human forces. Socialism can be achieved only by such a creative revolution, for Socialism is not the automatic product of outstanding forces. Man has heretofore ignored or resisted that which he should have helped to guide and shape.

It is because Norman Thomas has thoroughly weighed the forces, including the human forces, that are working today that he is unable to predict whether Fascism or Socialism will follow the New Deal. He cannot forecast whether our rendezvous with destiny will be other than a rendezvous with doom.

ANNA MAE DAVIS.

An Experiment in Production for Use

CREATE THE WEALTH. *By William Beard. 307 pp. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc. $3.00.*

This volume by the son of Charles Augustus Beard presents a concise and clear review of exactly how we have come to our present situation in America with so much want amid potential plenty. As a key to the understanding of our present status it really is of extraordinary value. This fact lends a special significance to the solution that the book proposes, just because it does look as though the nation is committed at least to trying it.

The solution is that those who are satisfied with capitalism continue to live by the capitalistic system, while the government creates a "Public System" for the victims of capitalistic competition. The government is to take over the idle factories, farms, etc., either by foreclosing on mortgages, taking for non-payment of taxes, or renting from the owners. The unemployed are to be put to work in these factories and on these farms, etc., and receive coupons, good for their share of life's goods. A great saving in Relief Funds will follow!

Mr. Beard knows the results of the National Survey of Potential Product Capacity's survey and the Brooking Institute's conclusions, etc. Yet he naively suggests that those families receiving no more than $800 or $1,000 per year be allowed to work in the "Public System," while all others must continue to depend upon capitalism for a living. It is here that the book shows its weakest spot. Talk about America divided into classes *now,* although we like to think of our people being "created equal!" How intensified would be the "class" distinctions with the capitalistic and "public" systems existing side by side!

Yet we must admit that with the majority of our citizens still pinning their faith to *one or the other* of the pompous, predatory parties that uphold capitalism, it is hard to answer Mr. Beard's last question—"Can America Escape a Trial of the Program?"—differently than he does.

The set-up of the volume is unique. It has a Photographic Introduction, showing the vast technological facilities of America, so many of which are now idle while multitudes perish in want. The contents of the ten chapters are connected, so as to make continuous reading. It is worth the space to give them here:

I. The Nature of a Technological Society
fosters
II. Abundance as a National Goal.
III. The Efficiency Movement Lights the Way
especially when
IV. Studies are Made of National Efficiency.
The studies show
V. Higher Living Standards Are Technically Possible
unless
VI. Foreign Trade Influences Living Standards
adversely.
VII. The Profit System
and
VIII. Production for Use
combined in
IX. An Experimental Program for Creating Wealth.
X. Can America Escape a Trial of the Program?

An excellent book to recommend to any of your friends who are not yet convinced that only by social ownership can an abundant economic life be made possible for all our people. After all, it looks as though Mr. Beard himself is aware that his plan would be only another experiment preceding the coming of Socialism.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

The Way of Liberty

HOW TO ABOLISH POVERTY. *By George L. Record. Jersey City, N. J.: The George L. Record Memorial Association. $1.00.*

George L. Record was one of the great American citizens of his day. Amos Pinchot, in his introduction to this attractive little volume, calls him "one of the most extraordinary men this country has ever known." I first met and knew him in the days of the Committee of 48. Previous to this he had been one of the outstanding leaders of the Progressive Party in 1912. Afterwards, he was active in the LaFollette movement. In his own state, New Jersey, of which, says his intimate friend and co-worker, James G. Blauvelt, in an impressive biographical foreword to this volume, "George L. Record was for more than thirty years the foremost citizen," he labored in the political field as in the vineyard of the Lord. For more than a

generation he fought against political corruption, corporation privilege and exploitation, the huge menace of the privately owned public utilities, and in season and out for tax reform. He ran independently for political office, three times for United States senator, not with any hope of election, but with the resolute determination to educate public opinion and arouse the people. He was one of the ablest platform orators of his day. His integrity, fearlessness, intellectual candor, and unselfish devotion to the public interest, stirred the admiration of his enemies and grappled a great host of friends to him "with hooks of steel." He was a matchless figure.

This little book, a masterpiece of clear and concise expository statement, presents an outline of the political and economic philosophy to which Record gave his life. It is a gospel of uncompromising radical reform, stemming from Henry George rather than from Karl Marx. For Record was an individualist to the core. He distrusted Socialism, fearing bureaucracy and inevitable political corruption, with dictatorship and the end of democracy not far away. At the heart of his personal thought, as of his public action, was the Single Tax, which was the guide and inspiration of his life.

This book, *How to Abolish Poverty,* is important as a restatement of the Single Tax idea in the light of contemporary knowledge and experience. But it is no doctrinaire presentation of the theme. Mr. Record, like his great master, Henry George, lived in no vacuum of inner speculation, and climbed to no ivory tower of esoteric dreaming. Always he was in the thick of the fight, and therefore his Single Tax theory was a pattern, so to speak, for a great program of reform which embraced every interest of our highly complex society. From this standpoint, this volume is only incidentally a Single Tax text-book, notable as it is as the latest addition to the abundant Single Tax literature of our day. Primarily, it is a discussion of the modern social and economic problem as centered in the human factors of our political and economic life here in America. Thus, these pages discuss the whole utilities problem, labor and unemployment, agriculture and farm relief, the New Deal and the sales tax, the tariff, the money question, taxes, privilege, and the distribution of wealth. As a primer of contemporary problems and their solution, this book is unrivalled.

Mr. Record was of course opposed to the New Deal. It was his idea that government should interfere in the economic life of the nation not to restrict or to repress, but to release. Repressive influences, such as monopolies, should themselves be repressed, but only thereby to free the uses of capital, and to insure the full flow of productive abundance. He believed that the consuming power of the masses, and the employment opportunities of labor were limitless, if only artificial barriers were removed, and free access to land and free interchange of trade were guaranteed. The problem, as Mr. Record saw it, is simple. One wonders if the restoration of a truly free society, rather than the elaborate mechanism of a rigorously planned society, is not what we want. Perhaps the increasing complexity of economic organization and centralizing of political authority is the doom upon us, as Oswald Spengler declared in his great book. Whether or no, *How to Abolish Poverty* is a forthright presentation of the way of liberty, and God knows we need it in this unhappy day.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Martyrdom

THE JEWS OF GERMANY—A STORY OF SIXTEEN CENTURIES. *By Marvin Lowenthal. 444 pp. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. $3.00.*

"To be Christian means: Love thy neighbor as thyself. My neighbor is my racial comrade. If I love him, I must hate his enemies. Who thinks German must despise the Jews. The one implies the other."

In these words, Paul Joseph Goebbels once stated the Nazi conception of applied Christianity. He also stated a conception far older than Hitlerism, extending back to the early Middle Ages. The black tragedy of German Jewry is, for all its horror, less a tragedy of the Jews than a tragedy of Christianity and a tragedy of German *Kultur.*

This tragedy Marvin Lowenthal has related in an excellent book—accurate, scholarly, readable, written with grace and beauty, illumined with rich knowledge of German and Jewish history and culture, and most informative for all who are ignorant of the background of Nazi Jew-baiting. This is a volume to be read, not to be summarized. Its narrative is fascinating and terrible. Its motif is intolerance. Its thesis, implied rather than asserted, is that through the centuries the Jew has played the role of the scapegoat upon whom have been discharged the tensions and aggressions bred in the German soul by spiritual ambivalence, intellectual and cultural obscurantism, ecclesiastical strife, class conflict, political disunity, and social and economic insecurity. The initial task of the warriors who took the Cross on the First Crusade was to slaughter German Jews. The first scapegoats of the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century and of the Black Death of the fourteenth century were the German Jews. In the Reformation the Humanists defended Jewry, and even Luther, in his early "liberal" phase, denounced Jew-baiting, but in the sequel Protestants and Catholics alike vented their spleen on Jewry. The Jews remained a pariah caste until the French Revolution, Napoleon, and nineteenth-century liberalism introduced new values and ideals. The false dawn of the Second Reich and of the Republic has again been followed by the impenetrable darkness of Nazi barbarism—with the new racial anti-Semitism more savage and heartless than the old religious anti-Semitism. Still the Jew survives. The apostles of persecution pass. "Scant choice of time remains. The world, and Germany, has but a few years to decide whether it will choose liberty, or—in battlefields too horrible to contemplate—it must choose death."

Only two criticisms are warranted. As a Jew, Lowenthal has tended, with comprehensible modesty, to understate somewhat—or at least not to emphasize sufficiently—the Jewish contribution to German civilization. As a Jew, he has somewhat slighted the inner tragedy of German Jewry. During the last century many German Jews gave up their own ancient and distinctive heritage and became "assimilated" and completely identified with German nationalism. When that nationalism disowned them they were utterly broken, with no will to resist and no spiritual refuge to return to .. In the Middle Ages victims of pogroms often resisted desperately and sometimes killed their own loved ones and themselves, rather than to suffer death at "Christian" hands. Today the paralyzing malaise

which rendered German liberalism and socialism impotent before the beast, which causes the forces of western liberal culture to suffer defeat after defeat at the hands of Fascism, has also left German Jewry helpless and desolate.

If this tale of incredible misery has any "moral" it lies in the closing words of the author's preface: "Jew and Gentile may learn that hatred and intolerance can never be banished, together with all the wanton miseries they provoke, until we can distinguish between men and their environment, until we can understand that the real enemies of humanity are not human beings—not members of sects, races, or nations—but social systems which breed and perpetuate injustice and exploitation. Jews, Germans, or any men are guilty only so far as having it in their power to help better society they put no hand to the task. And pending such betterment, every man owes it to his own honor and dignity, as well as to his ultimate safety, to tolerate even those whom he believes to be his enemies. For they are not enemies but fellow-victims."

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN.

Nationalism and Imperialism

FOREIGN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST. *By Taraknath Das. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, $2.00.*

Dr. Das calls this little book "a study of imperialism and nationalism." Much of it is a sordid story of intrigue and hypocrisy. If, therefore, you have any illusions left concerning international morality, do not read this book.

The chapters of the book are of unequal value and it seems to me that the first two are the best. In chapter one he deals with "The Position of the Oriental in the Present Day World," and in chapter two "The Significance of Political Trends in the Far East." In the first he points out quite rightly the fact that will disturb some good people, that racially the Orientals are the ancestors of some of the peoples of Europe. Mr. Hitler will not like his quotation from Muthu: "The majority of the European races were, therefore, a mixed produce of African and Asiatic races."

I am sure that the readers of UNITY will agree with Dr. Das when he says "If spiritual life has any value at all one must recognize the great contribution of the Orientals; because seven great religions of the world are products of the Orient," and again, "During the Middle Ages when the greater part of Europe was shrouded with the darkness of lack of intellectual life, it was the peoples of the East, especially the Arabs and Moors and the Chinese, who kept the torch of learning burning."

For the most part, this is a book for the casual reader and not for the expert in Far Eastern affairs. It is a good resume but contains nothing new. Furthermore, I am surprised that the author allowed some of his lectures to be put into a book without being brought up to date; for example, his discussion of the naval ratios of Japan and America.

The book is written from the standpoint of a conservative, and contains, at least so it seems to this reviewer, a great deal of wishful thinking. He even seems naive when he indicates that if the statesmen only had "the will to peace" they could have peace. The fact is, of course, that statesmen do not have the will to peace; they are inspired by the will to power.

In his discussion of President Roosevelt's foreign policies he rightly points out that much has been done to avoid a war with Japan but he makes no mention of the plan for air bases in Alaska and for the immense increase, building and proposed, in the American navy.

I quite agree with him when he quotes Mr. William R. Castle at a dinner of the American-Japan Society of Tokyo, "I know of no pair of nations whose interests more thoroughly coincide than those of Japan and the United States." Of course, it would be folly for the United States and Japan to go to war, for Japan is our best customer in Asia, and we are one of her most important customers. That side of the picture needs to be stated clearly.

On the other hand, it hardly seems realistic to smooth over the situation in the Far East and suppose that the United States will allow Japan to go ahead and gobble up all of China and perhaps the Philippine Islands—and merely write notes about it. Dr. Das pays his adopted country too high a compliment when he suggests throughout the book that we are the most peace-loving people in the world. If our government does not intend to fight in Asia, why are we spending such an immense amount in military preparation?

JAMES M. YARD.

Deluge of Blood

When you were the masters of Spain,
As landlord, noble and priest,
You sat in your proud disdain
And claimed the best of the feast.

You reveled in wealth and mirth,
With power at your command
To plan for a marvelous earth,
And rule for the good of the land.

You might have won the esteem
Of those you were called to lead,
And helped fulfil the dream
Of the poor who suffered need.

But all you have done is to reap
A harvest of sullen wrath,
And the lives you valued cheap
Invade your primrose path.

And whose is the fault but yours
For the cause of the raging flood
That over your country pours
A hideous deluge of blood?

CHARLES GUSTAV GIRELIUS.

Correspondence

Your Copy of UNITY

Dear Subscriber of UNITY:

What do you do with *your copy* of UNITY when you have finished with it? If you are not re-mailing UNITY to your local editor of newspapers, or to a prominent minister, or member of the nearest university, in your vicinity, then *please send me your copies* faithfully, as I place them where they are read and studied.

A prominent churchman writes: "I read every single word in UNITY."

The Universalist minister in our city met me one day and said "I missed receiving the last few copies of UNITY."

An excellent way, I find, of helping to increase the subscription list, is to re-mail UNITY for three to four months to a prominent resident in a city, one influential in communal affairs. Then *leave him flat,* allow him to get *lonesome* for this precious paper, and he will subscribe of his own accord! Start sending the paper to some one else and keep the ball rolling in this way. Occasionally send a little note, stating, "I hope you find the UNITY issues which I mail today of interest. I call your attention to a special article in the issue of ———— entitled "————." Your "future subscriber" will be contacted *now* in this way.

In unity there is strength so let us all join hands in the hope of giving UNITY magazine the immortality it deserves.

At this time I wish to thank three faithful subscribers who *religiously* re-mail copies of UNITY to me.

(MRS.) HENRIETTE POSNER.
552 Humboldt St., Rochester, N. Y.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 102)

This Conference also views with grave misgiving the invitation extended in certain parts of the country to unemployed men to take a holiday with the Army. In view of the fact that this scheme merely gives an attractive view of army life with none of its horrors, this Conference welcomes the refusal of this offer by the unemployed in certain towns, and advises them to demand in its place that the Government should offer them chances of useful work or full maintenance.

India

This Conference, whilst reaffirming its previous resolutions condemning all Imperialism and specifically demanding the recognition of Indian independence, desires to draw special attention to the renewal of repressive measures in India shortly before the inauguration of the new Constitution.

This Conference asks for a greater vigilance on the part of all who profess the principles of liberty in defending the elementary individual and political rights of Indians and exposing the contrast between the practice and promises of the Government.

Palestine

This Conference, whilst it appreciates the constructive achievements of the Jews in Palestine and is fully aware of the sufferings of the Jewish people in many parts of the world, cannot but condemn the policy of Imperialism, which Zionism has apparently accepted, whereby the Jews have entered Palestine under the protection of British forces and in defiance of the wishes of the Arab population. It regards the British Government's plan, by which a minority favorable to British rule has been artificially created in order to strengthen British Imperialism and give plausibility to its claims, as detrimental to Jewish and Arab interests alike.

This Conference regards with horror the conflict in Palestine which has been the direct result of the determination of British Imperialism to maintain its hold over that country in defiance of the declared demand for self-government by the Arabs, who form the majority of the population. It notes that leading members of the Conservative Party declared in Parliament on June 19th that retention of the control of Palestine was a matter of Imperial policy. It also notes that on the same day the Colonial Secretary gave a list of the measures which have been taken to defend these interests, and that these measures include censorship of letters and telegrams, powers of deportation, powers for arrest without warrant, collective fines on towns and villages, and life imprisonment for damage to property.

The No More War Movement, whilst in no way associating itself with the fascist tendencies among the wealthier Arabs or the outrages committed by Arab terrorists, upholds the Arab claim to their incontestable right to self-government by an elected democratic assembly. It maintains that Fascism among the Arabs is only encouraged by the measures of repression that have been used against their legitimate demands, just as Fascism in Germany was encouraged by the policy of the Allied Powers after the war.

We particularly urge all members of the Labor Party to reconsider the policy on Palestine officially adopted by that Party at Edinburgh. When that Party by an overwhelming vote supported the brutalities of British Imperialism, it was in conflict with the principles of democracy and self-government for which Labor professes to stand, also with the interests of the Jewish community in Palestine, and it foreshadowed an era of bitter antagonism between the two communities. We urge that this policy, which identifies the Labor and Socialist Movement with Imperialist repression, can only drive the Arab people into deeper conflict with the Jewish community, antagonize them to Socialism and increase the menace of Fascism. If Jews and Arabs are to live peaceably together in Palestine they must co-operate freely without the threat or menace of a shackling Imperialism.

This Conference therefore calls for the reversal of this policy, the withdrawal of troops from Palestine, the recognition of the right of self-determination and the abandonment of the Mandate, which has always been a hypocritical excuse for an indefensible regime.

An Englishwoman Looks at Europe

Sir,—Some young friends of mine took me to a most interesting public meeting recently, where it was explained that the Germans, having been reduced to poverty by the last war are now driven to spend £800,000,000 a year in order to begin another and that we must give them back all the Colonies we got as a reward for winning the war in order to stop them doing this.

I told my Anglo-Indian neighbor what I had heard; but it appears that the Colonies do not care for this idea. He has just come back from

another meeting, at the seaside, where it was decided that a Race for Re-armament is what we really need.

It seems that this race does not begin anywhere in particular and that any one can join in when they feel inclined to do so. Switzerland has just done this, though not a warlike nation. The chief speaker at the meeting seems to have said that he hoped, by joining in this race, to arrive at a general limitation of armaments and that the rate of advance in re-armament would be greatly accelerated in future. My neighbor explained that we could begin to disarm as soon as everybody was equally armed, but not before.

I am only an ignorant old woman, but to me this race sounds very much like one that was described in a children's book published about the time of the late Mrs. Steerforth's death: a Caucus Race it was called, and the Dodo, an extinct bird, told them when to stop. Also everybody won.

I only ask for information, but I am really most *anxious* to know how long this race will last and *who* is going to decide when the general level of armament has risen high enough for us to begin disarming? I do hope that, when it does stop, everybody will have won, as if everybody loses there is bound to be widespread discontent.

I am, your obedient servant,

ROSA DARTLE.

The Old Brick House,
Highgate.

—*Time & Tide* (London).

Once More—How Much Is a Billion?

A billion dollars for war appropriations was the record of the last Congress. How much is a billion? An insurance magazine recently asked that question in another connection, and it made this calculation:

If a young man were set to work on his twenty-first birthday counting a stack of silver dollars, and if he counted at the rate of ninety a minute, worked ten hours a day, 300 days a year (Sundays and holidays excluded), he would be almost eighty-three years old when he finished counting his first billion. It sounds preposterous, but here is the way it works: $90 x 60 is $5,400 each hour; $5,400 x 10 is $54,000 a day; $54,000 x 300 is $16,200,000 a year; 61.72 years would be required to reach the billion mark, so that the 21-year-old counter would be 82.72 years old when completing the task.

The same journal makes another interesting calculation:

If you had to distribute a billion dollars in one dollar gold pieces to the needy passing your door, and you were to hand out 100 gold dollars each minute, twenty-four hours each day, it would take fifteen years, five months, five days, twelve hours, and five minutes to complete the job without stopping for lunch or sleep, and you would have handled 3,900,000 pounds of gold, and would have required the use of 1,950 teams each hauling 2,000 pounds of gold to have met your demands. If the persons receiving the gold had been formed three feet apart in a line, it would have reached twenty-two times around the earth and two-thirds of another round.

No Frontier News Service.

Support for Birth Control Bill Growing, Says Margaret Sanger

Commenting on the report on birth control made by the American Medical Association, and issued by that organization last spring, Margaret Sanger, president of the National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control, said:

The report of the Birth Control Committee of the American Medical Association is not in any sense an indication of the attitude of the medical profession as a whole. Thousands of members of the American Medical Association, as well as over

(*Continued on page* 120)

Suggestions for Christmas Gifts

Introduce UNITY to a new reader
Trial subscription of . . .

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

For the enclosed dollar, send UNITY as a Christmas gift, for a trial period of six months to

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... State .....

Forthcoming special issues: Mexico, containing an article by Diego Rivera; Thomas Paine Anniversary, etc.

BOOKS

By
Dr. Jabez T. Sunderland
Proceeds to go to UNITY

India In Bondage $2.00
Truth About India ..... .10

UNITY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

Please send ☐ India in Bondage.
☐ Truth About India.

To .....

Street .....

City ..... State .....

Enclosed is remittance for .....

(*Continued from page* 119)

80 medical bodies (county, state, and national societies) have gone on record as endorsing the principles of birth control and efforts to amend the existing Federal statutes on the subject. This committee of six has not made a medical report but has attempted to pass on the population, eugenic, social, and economic aspects of birth control, and its opinion runs contrary to the findings of experts in these fields. It is safe to say that nine out of every ten population authorities, eugenists, and sociologists in this country are with the birth control movement.

The report holds that state and federal laws have not interfered with the giving of medical advice. Why, if this be true, do not all medical schools include the teaching of contraception in their curricula? Why are there only 250 clinics in the entire United States, and why do hospitals, for the most part, refuse to provide contraceptive advice to the millions of women patients whose lives are endangered by pregnancy? Why, finally, was a scientific exhibit on contraceptive practices, prepared for the annual session of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia, closed on May 6 under threat of federal prosecution?

The report further scores the failure of lay organizations to aid the poor whose cause they champion. Facts and figures from birth control clinics do not substantiate this charge, Mrs. Sanger said. In all clinics, practical help is given to the poor, and advice and supplies are furnished free to all who cannot afford to pay. It is true that the lower income groups are reproducing themselves faster than the upper income groups, but the solution is not less but more birth control. We must provide for the poor, who need it most, the information which is already possessed—and used—by the well-to-do.

Mrs. Sanger will have a Birth Controll Bill introduced early during the opening session of the Seventy-Fifth Congress, which convenes in January, 1937. It would permit the use of the mails and common carriers for sending contraceptive information and supplies to the medical profession in states where physicians are already permitted by law to prescribe birth control. It would rectify the paradoxical situation now existing, under which the laws of more than 40 states permit physicians to prescribe birth control to their patients and permit birth control clinics to function, while the Federal statutes make it a serious crime for any one (even a physician in these same states) to send supplies and information through the mails or common carriers.

Asked what the Birth Control Bill would accomplish, Mrs. Sanger stated that with its enactment birth control instruction for those who want it and need it could be made a part of maternity welfare work and included in the government public health program. She adds:

Only in this way can we hope to cope with our disgracefully and tragically high maternal and infant mortality rates. Why did the doctors fail to see the correlation between inadequate and unreliable birth control information and the fact that the United States has almost the highest maternal mortality rate in the civilized world? Mother's Day has given us the usual quota of fine speeches, flowers, candy, and sentiment. But it has not changed the yearly toll of mothers and infants dying needlessly. In 1933, according to figures issued by the United States Children's Bureau, 16,000 women died from causes assigned to pregnancy and childbirth. With all the advancements made in hospital care, obstetrics, nursing, and so on, our maternal mortality rate still remains high. I say without hesitation that this is so because women do not have adequate birth control information. This ignorance leads to abortions, and to childbearing when mothers are not physically fit to undertake it.

—*National Committee on Federal Legislation for Birth Control.*

Eddington Doubts Science Aids Faith

There is no approach of science to religion, according to Sir Arthur Eddington, recognized internationally as one of the foremost contributors to the fields of theoretical astronomy and physics.

He explained his religious position for the first time in six years at a recent dinner in the Town Hall Club, given by the Society of Friends in his honor as a fellow Quaker.

"In the past twenty years," he said, "science has grown less materialistic and more idealistic. While it is more hospitable to religious belief, however, the idealistic scientific philosophy of today is not the same as religious belief of any kind.

"On the one hand, materialistic scientific opposition to religion has disappeared. On the other hand, the intellectual danger which was feared from religion does not exist.

"I want you to understand, however, that there is no approach of science to religion and that science has nothing to say about religion. I do not think that we get a positive contribution to religion from science. When we explore the physical universe our methods are such that we can reach in that way only a part of the whole reality. When we come up against the question: What is religious insight or vision? that is outside the scope of investigation by the methods of physical science.

"And I want to emphasize most strongly that I do not think for a moment that we can get at the spirit of religion through scientific research. Sometimes when I get a visitor in my observatory and show him some of the marvelous things of the heavens, such as the Orion nebula, he rather disconcerts me by beginning to talk about God. I don't see God in the Orion nebula.

"Exactly how to define that spirit is difficult. When you see anything magnificent, you do have the feeling of worship. I suppose what is in my visitor's mind when he sees that spectacle is that he is confronting something stupendous. Of course that may be the Old Testament view of God, but I think the Friends emphasize the view of God as something comprehensible, to be approached by each one of us."

Sir Arthur said he was "born a Friend and never had any impulse other than to remain a Friend."

"As a scientist," he said, "I greatly appreciate that sort of belief of the Friends which does not require you to believe things which you find incredible. Belief is a matter of feeling, not of formulation."

—*New York Times.*

VITAL
CHALLENGING
INSPIRATIONAL

Printed addresses of

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Minister of
The Community Church
of New York

10 issues per season — Price $1.00
Write to

The Community Pulpit
550 West 110th Street
New York City

For Ministers and Laymen